

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph rejections and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have added new claim 22 which is claim 21 corrected for the 112 typographical error and written with the limitations from base claim 1. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13-15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Foss. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration as it appears that the teachings of Foss may have been misapprehended. As to claim 1, for example, the claim is directed to a signal phase shifting circuit that shifts the phase of a STROBE signal based on a clock signal. In combination, a variable delay circuit receives the STROBE signal and is responsive to a delay control signal wherein the delay control signal is produced by a clock signal dividing circuit. As such, the clock signal dividing circuit is used to provide a voltage control delay control signal for a STROBE signaling circuit. The Foss reference is directed to a completely different system from Applicants' claimed invention and is solely directed to compensating an input clock signal path using similar elements as the real circuit path. Foss does not contemplate, teach or suggest additional compensation or even a need to compensate for delays associated with a received path of a STROBE signal by controlling an input clock signal. In fact, there would be no need for the system of Foss in Applicants' admitted prior art since Applicants' admitted prior art already uses a delay line in a DLL with respect to the clock signal and since Applicants' admitted prior art teaches not to use other delays. In fact, it appears that they teach away from one another.

The Foss reference teaches providing a zero phase shift for an incoming clock signal. Applicants' admitted prior art shows that a STROBE signal may be delayed. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in either Foss nor Applicant's admitted prior art of compensation using a feedback delay matching array coupled as claimed to provide a phase shifted output signal of the STROBE signal associated with the double data rate communication since Foss teaches only delaying an input clock signal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants also respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made in the last response.

For example, other dependent claims are also allowable. With respect to claims 8, 13 and 18, Applicants respectfully note that this claim is also allowable since it requires that the phase shift generating circuit include serially coupled buffers and that the feedback delay matching array includes a plurality of serially coupled multiplexer and buffer stages operatively coupled to the plurality of serially coupled buffers. It is alleged that FIG. 5 of Foss teaches this structure. However, the multiplexer as shown is not a plurality of serially coupled multiplexers and buffers and instead shows a different configuration. Accordingly, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 5, 11, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art, in view of Foss and further in view of Allen. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to Foss and Applicants' admitted prior art and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, claim 3 requires, for example, that the feedback delay matching array includes a plurality of serially coupled buffer stages operatively coupled to compensate for delay variations associated with at least one phase shifted output signal drive buffer. However, the compensation system of Foss does not contemplate such a structure as admitted in the office action. In fact, paragraph 11 of the final action does not provide a prima facia

rejection of these claims since it admits that neither Applicants' admitted prior art nor Foss teach all of the limitations of the claim but fails to cite any portion of Allen that allegedly teaches what the admitted prior art in Foss are missing. As such, these claims are in condition for allowance. In addition, since there is no prima facia rejection of claims 3, 5, 11 and 16 in paragraph 11, Applicants also respectfully submit that if the rejection is maintained, that the finality of the rejection be removed as the Patent Office has not provided a prima facia rejection.

The other dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/25/05

By: C. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005